

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

VOL. XXVI, No. 4

BULLETIN

APRIL, 1947

The Security of Children in Postwar Britain*

SIBYL CLEMENT BROWN†

Member of the Government Committee on the Care of Children Deprived of Normal Home Life

It is a particular pleasure for me to be able to thank personally the members of the Child Welfare League of America for the hospitality and affection with which they received our children during the war. It is hard for me to express what it meant to us at a time of stress that we were able to entrust our children to you in confidence that they would be received with sympathy and understanding—confidence which has been well confirmed.

Children are good internationalists, and many of them have been able to take in their stride the differences between two continents, and to gain all that is best in the lives of the young of our two countries. I wish you could have heard some of them, perhaps at the age of seven or eight, discuss in a mature way the merits of our various methods of upbringing and education. Some young friends of mine were impressed with the patriotism of American children, and occasionally a little bewildered, as instanced by a child of thirteen, who asked the meaning of "allegiance," and then remarked "I am glad to know—I always wondered. I used to swear it every day."

In so many ways your imaginative concern for children who suffered from the war was brought home to us. I remember, for example, the delight of those who discovered in the pockets of their gifts of

clothes, little toy rabbits and frogs. It is small wonder that they began to think of America as a land of treasures. A toddler in Anna Freud's Nursery thought the word was "A merry car."

When I watched your G.I.s exchanging stories and playing with groups of youngsters in town and country, I was impressed with the fact that it was not only the child welfare workers who had the happiness of children at heart, but that the love of children and enjoyment of their company as individuals was characteristic of grown men and women here, and it was this universal friendliness which must have made our children feel so much at home in your communities.

International Concern for Children

There are special reasons why I am glad to have the chance of discussing the welfare of children with you at this time.

The security of children has become an international concern. This is no new development, as the valuable reports of the Child Welfare Commission of the League of Nations show. Recently at a month's study course organized in Switzerland by S.E.P.E.G.,‡ which was attended by clinical workers from six countries (unfortunately not including visitors from America), we learned something of the appalling problems which confront the combatant and particularly the occupied countries. Here there were children in displaced persons' camps, many of whom

* From a paper delivered at the dinner meeting of the Eastern Regional Conference of the Child Welfare League of America, Baltimore, March, 1947.

† Formerly Tutor, Mental Health Course, The London School of Economics and Political Science.

‡ Semaines Internationales d'Etudes pour l'Enfance Victime de la Guerre.

CONTENTS

	Page
THE SECURITY OF CHILDREN IN POSTWAR BRITAIN.....	1
THE PLACE OF CASEWORK IN THE INSTITUTION.....	6
EDITORIAL.....	8
1947 CASE RECORD EXHIBIT.....	9
BOARD MEMBER COLUMN.....	10
HOW THE CASE RECORD EXHIBIT WAS USED.....	13
EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES—SUMMER COURSES.....	14
BOOK NOTES.....	15

were homeless and stateless; repatriates, sometimes, transferred, like parcels, from one country to another; the illegitimate children of all armies; children mentally and physically injured, receiving treatment far from home—tragic problems of separation, alienation, divided loyalties, even loss of identity. At this conference we were able to discuss the possibility of international standards of child care—the use, for example, of standard record forms which should accompany any child crossing a national border. These forms have been designed at meetings of international organizations of mental hygiene and child psychiatry, also held in Switzerland this summer. It was because of the realization of clinical workers that in caring for the urgent physical needs of children their need for personal understanding and reassurance would be overlooked, that S.E.P.E.G. came into existence in Zurich within a few months of the end of hostilities, and their study courses are to be continued. Some of these problems will be discussed at the International Congress of Mental Hygiene which is to be held in London in 1948, at which I hope that many of us will meet again.

Another reason that I am glad to be here is because on this visit I have been asked to explore the possibilities of the interchange between our two countries of social workers and administrators. I am particularly interested in psychiatric social work and child welfare. There are clearly many practical problems to be thought out in such exchanges of employment, but the benefits which might come from the carrying over of ideas and experiences from one country to another are incalculable, and one might even go so far as to say that this sharing of professional interests was essential to the progress of real internationalism. As someone who has had the luck to have had some years of professional training and experience in both countries I know how much we have to learn here. For those who might come to Great Britain at the present time there might indeed be some degree of physical discomfort; but the plans of progress in social services and education, which are part of our effort to reinterpret democracy, could hardly fail to be of interest to those who are concerned with child welfare. These plans, which include social security, free medical services, and education which is to cater for individual treatment for every child with physical or mental handicap, go much further than any attempt we have so far made to provide full opportunities for every child. In the interpretation of these services the social worker will indeed have a task worthy of all the understanding and skill that she can muster.

The Significance of Separation

The war led to a ferment of ideas on every aspect of family life and the upbringing of children. Clinical workers were by the force of circumstances jerked out of the habitual framework of their practice. They followed the evacuated children into reception areas, the families into air-raid shelters and rest centers, the babies into residential nurseries. They became aware more acutely than ever before of the meaning of separation for the child, and the extent to which inner confidence had prepared him or left him unprepared for new experiences and for the facing of external dangers. In studies of the children who were separated from their parents we were able to see not only the obvious symptoms of stress with which we are familiar in all child guidance clinics, but also the unusual powers of adaptation which might be shown by children of all ages. Sometimes we found that the child might indeed make adjustments which rendered him more tolerable to those who were caring for him, but when we looked behind the superficial adjustment we sometimes found subtle changes of personality which did not manifest themselves in symptoms, and which might pass unnoticed in the ordinary way. We began to ask ourselves whether in the clinics of peacetime we were seeing some of the children who might need us most.

We were impressed with the fact that we had so far given little attention to the remarkable resilience of some children, and to the sources of such resilience.

Again and again we had confirmation of the importance to the child of the intimate, loving, enduring care of family life. All the evidence seemed to show that the child who had been able to count on this, the child whose internal dangers were not too frightening, could face external hazards with relatively little disturbance. Indeed the apparent serenity of some children in the face of such external dangers was sometimes a source of annoyance to worried adults, as instanced by the exasperated mother whose child remained so absorbed in a picture book during a raid that she turned to him finally with the words "drop the book and attend to the air raid!"*

Foster Care Must Be Supervised

Many of us were left with a greater sense of responsibility for the welfare of all the children in the community, particularly those for whom, because of the loss of their home life, public guardianship had been undertaken.

* Dorothy Burlingham and Anna Freud. *Young Children in Wartime*.

This immediate background of war experience was constantly in our minds when in February, 1945, a government committee of inquiry was set up to consider the welfare of children deprived of normal home life. The committee was appointed by three government departments—the Ministries of Health and Education and the Home Office. A letter to *The Times*, written by Lady Allen of Hurtwood in 1944, which drew attention to the poor methods of upbringing offered to some of these children in institutions, had been followed by a flood of correspondence. At the time of the appointment of the committee, the public conscience had been deeply stirred by the death of a thirteen-year-old boy—Dennis O'Neill—who had been placed by a county authority with foster-parents on an isolated farm. Public inquiry showed that he had died from undernourishment and ill-treatment. Selection and supervision had failed because of a series of incompetent judgments and muddled administration. The report showed that this child might not have suffered if personal responsibility had been clearly defined and accepted; if individual action had not been delayed by arguments between authorities; if office routine had been better planned and more carefully executed. Citizens became aware that in their name a child had been removed from his own parents because they had been regarded as unfit, and had been offered public guardianship which did not even save his life.

The committee was asked to concern itself with children who "for any reason whatever" were deprived of normal home life. They were therefore responsible for examining all forms of care from temporary foster care or life in the wards of a hospital, to long periods in institutions or legal adoptions.

The Report, which was published in October, 1946, revealed that a considerable number of children receiving care away from their own homes came under no supervision at all. For example, we protect children whose own mothers pay for them to be placed in foster homes, but we do not protect those who are placed without payment, though this may amount to a permanent arrangement. A mother may hand her baby to a woman in the next bed in the hospital, or may make a bargain with a woman in a shopping line, and no one would be responsible for seeing that this home was a fit place for the child. From discussions that I have heard at this conference I think that this might be true in some of the states here. In the comprehensive recommendations that were made, we provided for the approval and supervision of all such foster homes.

We were concerned to find that some children

spending long periods in hospital might have excellent care for their physical health and even for their education in the narrow sense, but might suffer from serious deprivation of personal affection and might spend long hours without interesting occupation. Indeed, the routine of hospital life might be such that there was positive discouragement of the child's own resourcefulness in entertaining himself. We saw also such remarkable work being done for physically and mentally handicapped children that it was clear to us that inherent difficulties could be overcome by imagination and patience even with the appalling shortage of staff with which we have been faced since the war.

The committee was not asked to consider the reasons for the child's separation from his parents, but this was naturally constantly in our minds. Professor Spence, who holds the chair of Child Health in the University of Newcastle, has for many years arranged that the mothers of young children taken into hospital for acute illness or operations, should stay in the hospital with their children and share the responsibility of their nursing, because he has found that children recover more quickly if they can be protected from the damaging effects of separation.

Another problem to which a great deal of attention was given was the temporary care of children during family emergencies or before permanent plans can be made for them. Children were still being sent to adult Public Assistance Institutions, and normal children might be associating with those who were grossly defective. Detention Homes had become seriously overcrowded during the war. The lack of suitable Reception Homes might lead to a choice of care which was governed more by expediency than by careful study of the needs of each individual child. We recommended that local public authorities should be responsible for seeing that there were good homes of this type in each area, providing a personal welcome for each child, and skilled help in studying his physical, psychological and social needs.

We became convinced, however, that there was no way of making quite sure that every child would be given continuous individual guidance without placing the responsibility for his personal guardianship with some one person who would represent, so to speak, the parental responsibilities of the community. So we recommended that in each area there should be a Children's Officer, who, with a specially chosen staff, should be charged with the supervision of each child from the moment he left his own home until he returned there, or became of age to care for himself.

Hitherto this responsibility has been given to a number of different departments of the local authorities, sometimes, as we have seen, with disastrous results. According to the plan that the committee put forward, there would be in each district in which there was a population of not less than five hundred children to be cared for, a special Children's Committee, whose sole function should be that of public "guardianship." The Children's Officer would be responsible to this Committee acting under the local government Council. These children would of course be entitled to all the other health and educational services which are available to all children, but it seemed to us that the function of homemaking was sufficiently distinct and important to be a first charge on a Committee which reported directly to the local County or City Council. The Children's Officer, who should be a fully qualified social worker, would have the status of the Education Officer or of the Medical Officer of Health in their respective departments, and be answerable only to the Children's Committee, though he or she would of course work closely with the other departments offering services to children.

At the level of Central Government—as in your Federal Government—it was regarded as important that there should be a merging of the various departments (five in all) now having responsibility for various groups of children deprived of normal home life, though it was not the task of this particular Committee to recommend which department this should be.

Homeless Children Need Substitute Families

The members of the Committee visited, without notice, at many inconvenient times of day, hundreds of children's homes and foster homes in many parts of the country. They consulted with many local executive officers, and had evidence from numbers of witnesses representing public and private agencies. As a result of their own observations and those of many experienced people they came to the conclusion that for children permanently deprived of upbringing in their own homes the most desirable plan was adoption. But the very merit of adoption carries implicit risks, and we were not satisfied that our present law provides good enough protection for the adopted child. We have careful, detailed provisions which lay down standards of procedure for private societies acting as agents for adoption; but it is still possible, as I understand that it is also in some states here, for children to be adopted on the direct request of their parents to the court, without adequate guarantee that the inquiries will be carried

out by skilled social workers, and even without careful medical examination of the child and information about the physical and mental health of the adoptive parents. The recommendations suggest quite a number of reforms in the adoption law.

Our second choice for the majority of children was a foster home, though we recognized that for some children residential homes might provide more suitable care, and that it was a mistake for these to be regarded as rival forms of care. Nevertheless it was clear that in England it was still to some extent a question of chance as to whether a child coming to the notice of a private or public agency found himself placed in a foster home, or spending many years in an institution, and this seemed to us to be wrong. We found that many of our private foundations for children had done admirable work, and we did not think that they should be prevented from developing the form of service in which they had come to excel. The rights of the child to the care best suited to him would, we thought, be safeguarded if our plan for the Children's Committee and the Children's Officer were carried out, for this *final* responsibility would apply not only to the children under public care, but to the children placed by private organizations in the area.

We found that on the whole the children in foster homes showed signs of more natural, healthy, vigorous development than the children brought up in groups—particularly those who spent many years in large institutions in which they were classified into age groups and lived in too isolated a way from the surrounding community.

In the residential homes we found very varied standards indeed. There were some in which children were divided into small groups cared for by a house-mother, where the "cottage" was really like a home, and where the children took part in neighborhood life, and shared in the day-to-day activities of marketing, saving and spending their own money, owning their own possessions, joining local clubs and making friends outside as well as inside the home. There were others in which nineteenth century ideas still prevailed; in which buildings were bare and forbidding, and children were regarded by neighbors as a group to be blamed or pitied rather than as individuals belonging to the community as other children belonged. One building housing such a group was described by the air-raid precautions officer who visited it to need no reinforcement as it was "like a fortress already." In some homes children had far too little opportunity for spontaneous play; they had nowhere to keep their personal possessions, and

meager opportunity for any individual life of their own. Shortage of staff, or unsuitable staff meant that they had little of the mothering attention that we all recognize as the right of childhood.

Almost all these children already attend public schools with other children in the neighborhood, but we felt that the new provisions in our Education Act of 1944 which provides for free boarding schools for children who need them might well be used for some of the children who at present go to institutions, the children returning to foster homes for the holidays. We were also impressed with the value of the small hostels which had been developed in the war to care for unstable children for whom few foster parents could take responsibility.

The best of the homes proved conclusively that it was not impossible to offer to the deprived child a happy and varied life. We thought that these homes should never cater for more than a hundred children, and that they should be divided into small households of not more than ten, and preferably eight. We found that boys and girls could be very successfully absorbed into such households together, and that it was better both for the little children and for most adolescents if the ages in the "family" were varied.

The problem of the staff was found to be an extremely serious one both from the point of view of their number and their training. So important did the committee regard this that they issued an Interim Report on the training of housemothers and housefathers. In this report it was recommended that a special National Council for Training in Child Care should be set up, and that this Council, composed of representatives of public and private services and training bodies, should establish standards for courses of training all over the country, for which scholarships should be granted from public funds. Training of this kind has so far only been provided by one or two of the large voluntary organizations for child care. Already, since the publication of the Report, further private organizations have worked together in running a central training course.

We have been more than ever impressed in Great Britain with the fact that the security of children depends upon the serenity of the adults who care for them, upon their spontaneous affection, their understanding and their tolerance. We cannot therefore consider the security of children without being concerned with the whole life of the community. Our plans for the care of the child deprived of normal home life must go along with the progress of other services which protect family life—provisions for

social security, children's allowances, better housing, full employment and education. No real substitute can be found for the child's own parents.

In our generation we have spent much thought on the remedy of the problems that arise from unwise parenthood, but we have sometimes been less critical of our own conduct as public parents.

The children of today have great issues to face. For this they will need all the resourcefulness, all the vitality, all the fortitude and the tolerance of which they are capable. Such qualities most of us believe to be the outcome of inner serenity which is primarily dependent upon personal relationships, and these should be put first in all our plans for the care of homeless children. All our laws, all our administration should be measured against the degree to which they can safeguard such relationships. Nothing less is needed for true security.

League Membership

THE following agencies have been admitted as provisionals:

THE DAY HOME
1600 Seventh Avenue
Troy, New York

PORTLAND BARY HYGIENE AND CHILD WELFARE ASSOCIATION
96 Danforth Street
Portland 3, Maine

The following provisional has become an accredited member:

CHILD WELFARE DIVISION
State Public Welfare Commission
Spalding Building
Portland 4, Oregon

From Social Work Year Book 1947

DESPITE the discouraging failure of the Federal Government, the states, and most local communities to sustain adequate group day care programs, there is a growing awareness of the importance of this type of day care. . . . The extent of need for day care services is greater now than in 1941, because of the increased number of homes in which the mother is the sole or major support of the child or must work to supplement the father's earnings. — Alice T. Dashiell in *Day Care of Children*.

The Place of Casework in the Institution*

MAE DIFFENBAUGH, *Superintendent*

Bethesda Children's Christian Home, Philadelphia, Pa.

CASEWORK'S contribution to the institution program has long been a subject of serious consideration in the field of children's institutions. It is still a challenging subject but no longer controversial. However, I believe I am safe in saying that the concept of casework as an integral part of the total service is not yet generally accepted. Experience is proving that casework not only has a place in the program of the institution but that its place is defined; that in relation to the other parts of service and in co-operative effort with those other parts, it functions freely and effectively for the maximum benefit to the child in care. Moreover, the caseworker is free to work only when the institution staff recognizes the need for each other's help with the child's problems. It is essential, too, that the Board and staff of the institution be sensitive to the needs of the children they serve and willing to provide the facilities necessary to meet those needs. This implies sound administration of every aspect of the service. The philosophy of casework as outlined herein has evolved from eight years of experimentation in a small institution specializing in the care of adolescent girls. During these years the Board and staff have studied untiringly the problems and the policies and procedures in an effort to correct and improve the service to the child and to the community. This is but a single experience, but the basic principles that were evolved can apply, regardless of the size of the institution or the specific nature of its service.

In this paper focus is on the place of casework rather than on the casework process itself and the case illustrations were selected accordingly.

The caseworker is in the strategic position of establishing the first contact with the parent who comes for help in placing his child and in this beginning experience the foundation is laid for the relationship which will continue throughout the child's stay in the institution. She is the agency's representative and interprets the agency's service, as well as the parent's continuing responsibility and support to the institution on behalf of his child.

From the beginning she is engaged with the parent in examining the critical step which he is about to take (a step fraught with anxiety and doubt and at

times with relief). At the same time, insofar as it is possible, she is responsible for helping the child to understand what this new group living experience may mean to him, and to prepare him for it.

Although at the point of intake the caseworker carries with the parent the authority for the decision to admit the child to the institution, contacts with the parent and child are not limited to her alone. The first contact with the housemother is of great importance to the parent since she is the person he would most frequently see when visiting his child. His response to her warm, spontaneous interest is often a determining factor in his decision to entrust his child to the institution's care. The housemother's role is differentiated here from that of the caseworker, as responsible for the daily living of the children in all its complexities and for natural social contacts with parents. The caseworker continues to be the official representative carrying the agency's authority.

The Role of the Houseparent

The caseworker's role is more generally recognized and accepted by institution staff during the intake process than at a later period after the child has been admitted to the institution. Certainly the child's situation is changed now and the parents' as well. The child may be preoccupied with the new and strange life upon which he has embarked—his group, his school, his houseparent, his recreational activities and his caseworker may seem to be removed and apart from this new living situation. His houseparent or his group or his group work leader may be of paramount importance to him in giving him the help he needs. Often a caseworker (and this is particularly true of students) will question her place with the child who is making a good adjustment. She loses sight of the fact that the group living is the primary function and if a child is able to establish himself in the group with little direct help from her so much the better.

On the other hand, she is always connected with his total situation and related to him directly through the school, the medical clinic, the houseparent and his family.

Frequently a child does not adjust easily and quickly to this new experience and reacts to this

* Delivered at Eastern Regional Conference of Child Welfare League of America, Baltimore, March, 1947.

change in his life in a variety of ways. The expression of his problem may take the form of withdrawal from the group as one extreme, or of open hostility and aggression as the other. Often the feeling of hostility is acutely projected on the houseparent, and the caseworker has a serious obligation to help her to understand this behavior at the same time recognizing the houseparent's right to deal with it directly and realistically.

In the casework relationship the child finds himself free to express all of his feelings whatever they may be and as a result he is likely to attempt to use this relationship as a threat to the houseparent. But when the caseworker and the houseparent, each separate and distinct in her individual way of helping the child, are united in the common purpose, the child achieves a sense of the institution's strength which is security for him.

The following interview with a fifteen-year-old girl who flagrantly violated the rules over a period of months and whose hostility toward her housemother had steadily mounted, illustrates the caseworker's place in relation to the girl as well as to the housemother.

I asked to speak with Emily after school today. She came in with the attitude I have learned to expect—a sort of “no matter what you say, I’ll deny it” approach. She sat down in the chair and waited for me to speak. Throughout the interview she looked straight ahead or away. I asked if she’d been to school today and if she had come home on time. She said she had done both. I said “good.” She shrugged her shoulders. I commented that she didn’t seem to feel very good about it. She had promised me, she said, that she would and she meant to keep her promise. I said that was a great deal in view of her dislike of school and that I felt relieved that there was only another week of school left. She talked awhile about school—how dull it is and how little she gets out of it, or even out of living for that matter. She went on then to express her resentment of being here, of being distrusted all the time, checked or made to do this and that. I encouraged her to talk by occasional questions which she answered and elaborated on; the tone of her speech was resentful and defensive; she never smiled and she could find no good in the situation. She expressed the feeling that her family cares not at all for her; that she can’t even visit them because she’s either in punishment or they can’t have her and anyway they like Inez better.

I recognized that life must seem pretty dismal to her under the circumstances and that her situation is by no means easy, but at the same time, I wondered if it were helping her any to act as she does. Her whole bearing carries a defensiveness, a sort of “I dare you to please me” attitude; at least that is how it seems to affect me. I also pointed out that Mrs. Langley feels that Emily is deliberately defying her, that she is trying to see how far she can go without being put out, and that she gives us little opportunity to work with her. I referred to the previous Friday night when she had refused even to speak with Mrs. Langley. She said, “I can’t speak to her—she practically calls you a liar before you open your mouth.” I realized that she felt that way, but I also wondered if she hasn’t given Mrs. Langley occasion to feel that she is lying. “If you tell the truth you catch it anyway.” I knew she was feeling

pretty caught, but I felt that the situation was not impossible to break up if each of them were able to bury the axe, and make a genuine effort to get together. Emily felt that it wouldn’t happen, that Mrs. Langley holds a grudge; I felt that Emily might have to make the initial move, but that Mrs. Langley was probably as tired of this whole thing as she is herself and might be glad to get back on a better footing. I offered to arrange a three-way conference if she felt that would help; Emily remained skeptical, but eventually decided she’d make an effort to meet Mrs. Langley’s terms and I pointed out that by going to school she had begun. I said I’d be glad to help in whatever way I could—that perhaps if she could feel free to express her pent-up feelings to me instead of exploding to Mrs. Langley, it might help. She said I was staff and what one staff member knew we all knew eventually. I said I had the right of discretion and she’d have to trust me to use it; as evidence I could offer the fact that I felt Friday’s affair at school could remain a closed issue between us and Mrs. Langley need not know. I respected her for having been able to tell the school counselor—and felt that was enough. She seemed to relax a little.

I wondered if she felt that her association with Mabel was doing either of them any good—that each of them separately might avoid some trouble. She admitted her reason for going with Mabel was mostly that they attend the same school—and thought it might help if they didn’t spend so much time together.

I also thought that if she could smile occasionally (here she shrugged and said she had nothing to smile about) or at least act and talk as though she weren’t challenging a person to prove her wrong, it might encourage people to work with her too. She pretended not to know what I meant, but I felt she did. I said then that it would be a lot easier for all of us if we could operate and remove the sources of our troubles, but since they weren’t operable we’d have to try to get along with them. Emily almost smiled and as I said “Well, let’s see how it goes” she got up to go. I felt a little encouraged by the amount of negative she had been able to express, but it seems awfully hard for Emily to trust anyone’s good intentions.

The relationship between caseworker and houseparent demands of both an acceptance of the role of the other and a willingness to share the mutual responsibility which the institution places upon them. This is no mean achievement as at times it is difficult to reconcile the individual ways of helping the child. As previously stated, the caseworker and the houseparent are united in the common purpose and the child finds security in this stronghold.

The Use of Psychotherapy

The child may be so seriously disturbed that the group living experience and the casework help may fall short in reaching him and psychotherapy is the logical next step. This facility may be a part of the agency’s program or if the institution is small, a community service may be utilized. Our practice is to refer a girl to the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic, the caseworker assuming in the Clinic-Agency situation the place of the parent. While the girl is treated by the therapist the caseworker has inter-

(Continued on page 11)

BULLETIN

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America.

Henrietta L. Gordon, *Editor*

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$2.00

Single copies, 20c.

Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

The League and its Members—A Team

EIGHTEEN months have elapsed since the League undertook a program of increased service to the child welfare field. During this time the acceleration of service, based on the framework of the Five-Year Plan, has continued. There is nothing grandiose in this new program. In keeping with the enlarged needs of postwar child care, it simply lays down the objectives which are necessary for Agency and National alike if we are to succeed in our job, that of strengthening and developing services devoted to family and child life.

To say that the League's Board and staff are completely satisfied with its progress would suggest lack of awareness of their responsibility. Quite apart from concern over increased agency loads caused by wartime social change, they are aware of the alarming growth in unemployment, the failure of the housing program, the shortages of trained personnel in schools, and social agencies, and the host of other acute problems which make further demands on child welfare agencies. Whether the specific objectives of January, 1946, will be sufficient in 1950 will be for the League's Board and membership to say. But much support needs yet to be developed if the schedule of acceleration is to keep pace. Basic to this support is the wholehearted backing of the members and protagonists of better children's services.

The League can be essentially what its members make it. In many ways the service it has rendered has been because of close relationship with its members, and their increasing assumption of responsibilities within the League and the child care field. The principles, organization, and practices of each member agency are the core of the League's strength. It is in the dissemination of their experiences among all agencies and institutions in the child care field that needs of children are met. As the medium of this exchange the League must remain conscious not only of its responsibility to render service to its members but also to others to the end that the level of child care throughout the nation be raised. It must continue to give leadership and direction to children's services on a national scale, to interpret needs and encourage high standards. As the distances between countries and hemispheres become shortened

there is an added trusteeship and responsibility in the well-being of children and their families everywhere in the world.

It is a tribute to the vitality and strength of our federation that throughout the war period it has steadily increased in size and continued to carry good standards of child care to all parts of the United States and Canada. This has been accomplished in the face of rising costs by increasing demands on the energies of a too-small staff complement. If this growth is to continue with its new impetus there are necessary moves which must be taken. Actually they are the same urgent steps necessary to the common goals of both the local agency and the national federation:

1. To publicize aggressively the program of the League and its members in the work being done in child care. This failure to interpret understandably what is going on in our field constitutes one of the great weaknesses of social work today. We continue to take for granted that the word *child* constitutes interpretation and justification of what we do and what needs to be done.

2. To recognize and push necessary budget expansions in the care of children in the community and on the national level. More children are requiring care of one type or another and costs have skyrocketed. These are facts that must be placed before the public forcefully. The minimum budget of \$174,150 of the League carried with it the promise to its membership that staff will be increased to a point where all areas of League service will be adequately covered.

3. To develop and inspire once again the spirit of mature leadership. What is called for certainly is the kind of leadership that is not afraid to put out its neck in working toward the immediate and distant objectives in child care. It means that elder statesmen and new will join counsel and effort to that end. You may be sure that the League in its role as consultant, teacher, and friendly critic will do its part.

4. To practice democracy as we study, plan, and work together within the field. No matter what the cost in time or trouble the processes by which we change social services for children will spell success or failure. It is only logical that a field such as ours should develop its movements and stresses, its "public or private," its mergers, or its "functional or nonfunctional." These can be healthy but the resulting loss will be heavy unless we join lay and professional groups in the same orderly, democratic procedure that we would wish to be used in developing a world safe for children.

Membership within the League, and for that matter, in any organization, is a two-way thing. Responsibilities accordingly flow in each direction. The League's accelerated program is under way and its future the concern of us all. By working together we will accomplish far more than any single agency working alone.

SPENCER H. CROOKES

1947 Case Record Exhibit

As this report is being written, the 1947 Case Record Exhibit is traveling across the country to make, as customarily, its first appearance for use at the National Conference of Social Work. The chairman of the National Committee, except for a period of activity at the beginning of the Committee's work, takes, as it were, a position on the side lines while fourteen Regional Committees are hard at work, culling and selecting records representing the best in casework practice from League agencies within their boundaries. She is actively caught up in the process again at the high peak when the Regional Committees' hard work and effort come to fruition in the sending in, in finished form, their thoughtfully considered and responsible selections. It is a stimulating experience, eliciting one's genuine respect and confidence in a profession which can work so responsibly and so productively on a teamwork project that can reach every staff member in every League agency in the country.

Records came in from every one of the 14 regions, and the tangible result is 91 records from 49 agencies in 25 states and the Territory of Hawaii. With staff shortages, staff turnover, and a variety of other pressures still existing, this represents a real gain over last year, in the number of states participating though the number of contributing agencies remains the same. Many agencies participated which for various reasons were not in a position to submit records, and they express the very real value that accrued to them as a result in terms of stimulation and an added vitality. On the other hand, members of the Regional Committees whose agencies were able to participate to the full, speak of the value to them of having had the wider participation made possible by encouraging the activity of the agencies unable to submit records.

Perhaps the most enthusiastic response came from those regions where member agencies acted on the recommendation of last year's and the current planning committees that they appoint staff committees to consider whether they had records that might be submitted for the Exhibit. Where this was done there seems to be common agreement that there would be value for the agency to have a staff committee operating the year 'round for this purpose, their conviction being that in this way the selection of the best the agency has to offer will be assured in a way that is not possible in an intensive search over a limited period of time. Too, that constant awareness and measuring of practice and recording against the

recommended criteria would result generally in a more qualitative level of casework service within the agency. In spite of our earlier start this year, an even earlier beginning has been widely and strongly urged. Perhaps these staff committees operating on a year-'round basis is one answer, though recommendation that Regional Committees operate similarly has come from a number of those currently active, particularly from those areas where, because of distance they have to work mostly through correspondence.

It is interesting and significant that strenuous and demanding as this committee activity was freely admitted to be, just as freely it was volunteered by Regional Chairmen on behalf of themselves and of their committee members, particularly where they had been able to have one or two meetings, that they were more than amply rewarded in the return to them of stimulation. As it was put by some: "You have to experience it yourself really to understand what it means. You can't put it in words."

Satisfaction with the simplified statement of the recommended criteria for selection of records was expressed. The addition of recommendations for criteria for selection of boarding or adoption home studies bore fruit in that a total of 19 such records (as against two last year) are available this year, about half of each type. Three show agencies' decisions to reject the application after study.

As last year, there are a large number of records having to do with adoption and work with unmarried mothers. There are records showing work with children in foster homes, or institutional care, and with their own parents and foster parents. There are surprisingly few on Day Nursery care—only two—and one on Family Day care, and all three are focused on work done with the parents. For those interested in Protective service for children, there are several such records. The Exhibit is now ready for circulation.

As yet the National Committee has not made its selection of records for the Permanent Library. We anticipate a truly qualitative addition to it from this year's annual Exhibit.

RUTH WEXLER

National Chairman, Case Record Exhibit Committee

New League Publications

DAY CARE CENTERS FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN: PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION. By Clara M. Allen. Price \$1.00.

A PRELIMINARY REPORT OF A STUDY OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN EVALUATING CASE WORKERS. Special Bulletin, compiled by Zitha R. Turitz. Price 50 cents.

BOARD MEMBER COLUMN**TRUSTEESHIP IN DAY CARE**

Board membership is a responsibility that demands something more than attending an occasional board meeting and paying dues. A board member of a Day Nursery should be interested in the welfare of children, not only in terms of providing food and shelter, but with the understanding that they are individuals in their own right, and future adults. They need the best that we can give them in good health and educational programs.

This has not always been the feeling of members of boards of directors. In years gone by Day Nurseries were usually headed by an elderly Matron, assisted by anyone who cared to help. Children were taken into the Nursery until the walls bulged. There was no segregation of age groups, food was not adequate and there was little or nothing in the way of toys and equipment to keep them occupied. Boards were often composed entirely of women of the leisure class, whose primary function was to raise funds to support the organization, and the feeling prevailed "that as long as the children were off the street" they were being properly cared for. Unfortunately there are still Day Nursery board members who feel that custodial care is quite sufficient.

The progressive board thinks in terms of trained personnel, medical care, casework service and a good educational program.

Changing from custodial to an educational form of Day Nursery care cannot be accomplished overnight. There are always the board members who have been on the board for fifteen or twenty years or more, whose sister, cousin, friend or relative has been president at some time or other and who feels that any change in the Nursery program is a reflection on their management. It can be granted that they did as good a job as they knew how in those days, just as we can be sure that what we consider good methods today may be outmoded twenty years hence. We cannot stand still. We must progress or we retrogress.

It would seem then, that in changing from custodial care to an educational program, the first thing to be done would be to educate the board. There are usually one or two board members who are more active than the rest, who visit the Nursery and spend some time with the director. If the director is a trained person with progressive ideas in child care, she can, in her conversation with these active board members gradually stimulate their interest in new and better ways of managing a Day Nursery. She

can encourage them to visit Nurseries with an educational program, and attend meetings of child care agencies. They in turn will report their experiences to their board, getting more and more members to attend child care meetings. Meanwhile, when new equipment is needed, the director will see that suitable equipment is supplied, tables and chairs of the proper size and built for proper posture, toys, books, music, all with educational value. Gradually the director will be able to convince her board of the importance of a trained staff. By the time this has been accomplished, the board has become very proud of its Nursery. They begin to talk about their trained staff and their educational program. If the Day Nursery is not headed by a trained executive director, then it is the duty of the board to see that the proper person is found to fill that position. Recently a bill was passed by the state of New Jersey establishing standards in child care, which means that all Day Nurseries in that state will have to have trained personnel.

It is important that all board members be prepared for their position. They should be taken to the Nursery to observe the program. They should be told what is being done and why and what is expected of them as a board member. If they should find that it was not what they had anticipated, it is better to know before they become a member, thus eliminating more "dead wood" on the board.

There should be variety in the type of board member asked to serve on a Day Nursery board. It should be a representative board, with perhaps a doctor, a lawyer, a businessman, a school teacher and a clergyman from the community. This need not exclude the friend or relative of the present board member if that person has something to offer the organization.

Rotating form of board membership would be an ideal arrangement. There may be opposition to this way of thinking because of the general feeling that the board loses its good workers as well as the others. It may be possible to avoid this by an arrangement whereby the good workers can be re-elected for an additional term. This, too, may be opposed because of "hurt feelings." Individual feelings should not enter into the management of a good Day Nursery board. The first consideration should be for the welfare of the organization and the children entrusted to its care.

While no board wants to lose all of its older members, it is well to also have young people on the board. One Day Nursery organized a junior board about

twelve years ago. This board was started with a few of the daughters and daughters-in-law of senior board members. Seeking a definite reason for being, they chose to sponsor the educational program, as their particular project. That is, they planned to raise the funds with which to purchase educational equipment. The educational program at that Nursery was just in the making, and needless to say there were no extra funds for special equipment. Funds were raised by having two bridge parties and a rummage sale each year. In this way they have not only supported the educational program, but have provided that Nursery with many other things such as individual lockers, washing machine, refrigerator, draperies, etc., things that were not within that agency's budget. Also a fund was established to send the director and teachers to conferences and to help finance further education for them. While the senior board of that Nursery has not as yet accepted a rotating form of membership, the junior board has. At the end of three years a junior board member may become a senior board member at the discretion of that body. At the end of five years, if a junior member does not want to become a senior member she must take a leave of absence of one year from the board, after which time she may again apply for junior board membership. This provides the senior board with new and younger board members each year.

It is important for the board member to know her agency, what is being done now and where do we go from here, always striving to improve the service given by the Nursery. She should be willing to attend board member institutes to keep abreast of the times. If the agency participates in the local Community Chest, board members as well as staff members should attend these and other child care agency conferences and meetings. The board should make it possible for the director and staff members to attend courses to further their education in child care.

There should be a friendly relationship between the board and the staff, for only in this way can they work well together for the good of the children. This does not mean, however, that the board should interfere in any way with the authority of the director.

With the proper relationship between the director and the president of the board, they can work out mutual problems, the director interpreting the work of the Nursery to her staff and the president to her board and through the board to the community.

It is the duty of the board to establish the policies

and standards of the Nursery and staff and to see that they are carried out through the director.

There was a time when it was not considered good policy to have the director attend board meetings, particularly those meetings concerning finances. Today it is considered just as important for the director of a Day Nursery to be well informed on the state of the finances of her agency as it is for a business manager to be so informed. The director should be asked to attend all board meetings. The director of a Day Nursery should be a competent person capable of handling finances.

Last, but by no means least, we come to the financing of the Day Nursery. Many Day Nurseries are supported by their local Welfare Federation and their allocation of funds depends on the success or failure of the Community Chest drive. In the progressive Day Nursery that is constantly striving to improve its service and where fees from the children are negligible, funds are never sufficient without supplemental sources. It then becomes the duty of the board to raise the additional funds so that the program may be carried on without reducing the standards of the organization.

MRS. WALTER H. HILDICK

East Orange, N. J.

The Place of Casework in the Institution

(Continued from page 7)

views with the Clinic's social worker. Her activity in this case is increased by even closer contact with the housemother during the treatment period.

The Role of the Parent

The continuing relationship with the parent is a unique contribution which casework brings to the institution field. Because the child must leave the institution eventually, the placement here is never permanent in the strictest sense and the ultimate goal for the child and for his parent is his return to the home. The parent is closer physically to the child and to the agency than would be possible in the foster home agency and there is no threat of a foster mother or foster father. The policies of many institutions permit week-end and holiday visits and summer vacations with parents. In short, there is, increasingly more freedom for the parent to see his child.

But with freedom comes responsibility and an obligation on the part of the parent to sustain the child and the institution in the placement. Very early he may realize that he cannot accept separation from his child after all; or that he cannot resist

his child's entreaties to be taken home despite his conviction that this placement is good. He may be unwilling or incapable of adhering to the regulations imposed upon him by the institution. In any case, it is incumbent upon the caseworker to clarify again for him, his own part in the parent-agency partnership, leaving him free to decide finally whether his child is to leave or to stay.

When the parent can accept positively the placement as valuable for the child and can offer the necessary support, the chances of its success are relatively assured.

Excerpts from an interview with the father of a thirteen-year-old girl on his first visit to the institution, and from a subsequent interview with the girl, reveal a problem for child and parent and the caseworker's place in relation to both.

Mr. White talked a lot about how bad the mother's home situation is, and said that he felt that Julia should not visit in the home. I said that I knew what he was telling me is true. I knew that if the Court felt the need of removal of the children from the home that there was a reason. I guessed it did seem hard for him to understand why we would continue to allow Julia to visit her mother even when we knew this. I suggested that he probably did know very little about Bethesda and proceeded to tell him about the living here. He had some idea that children were just committed here and I told him that many of our children come because their parents want them to. We never accept a child unless her parents are willing for her to be here. In his case it had been different because he was in the Army. He made some apology for not answering Miss Lee's letters and since Children's Aid Society was taking charge of the children he felt that he would leave the decision to them.

Mr. White seemed to be pleased about what I was telling him about Bethesda. In regard to visiting, I said that we feel that a girl needed to be able to do this in order to stay here. We did not want to give her a completely sheltered experience, but wanted her to be able to leave. I felt, too, that Julia and her mother are very devoted to each other and I could not see how we could deprive Julia of this love. I said that we had found Mrs. Johns, the mother, very co-operative and that she had done a lot for Julia here by showing so much interest in her. It has meant a great deal to Julia to know that somebody was very much interested in her. Mr. White seemed quiet and I said that we did not know how interested he was in Julia. Certainly the only way that we could know would be by his willingness to write to us, to see us. Mr. White said that he is interested and wanted to do as much as he could for her. I thought it would be awfully good for Julia to know this. I realized that it had been pretty hard for him with his reluctance to come here where he might see his former wife. Mr. White said that it certainly was very hard and that was why neither he nor the grandfather visited. I thought that now that he had made the break it might be a little bit easier for him to come here, and he could arrange to come when Julia's mother was not here. . . .

Mr. White said again that he did not think that Julia should be permitted to visit in her mother's home. It was all right for the mother to visit her, but he did not like the idea of Julia going there. I said that the way we were set up I did not see how we could make

any restrictions on Julia's freedom in this respect. Mr. White did not say anything but I felt that he could not accept this. I told him a little bit about Julia and how pleased we are with her progress here. I asked how she had impressed him since he had not seen her for such a long time. She seemed O.K. to him but he had thought that she would be a good deal taller. He was pleased to hear that she was getting along well and doing good work in school. We came back to talk about visiting and Mr. White said that he would like her to come to his home for week ends. I said that this probably could be arranged and Julia could spend her free time between her mother and father. . . . Julia has talked with me about spending part of her summer vacation with him. Mr. White said he would like this but would want her to spend the first week with him and the second with her mother so that there would be no chance of her contaminating the children with him. He said that he might just as well be frank about this because he knew what conditions were like. I thought that this could be worked out. Mr. White said that he would talk with Julia about visiting and would let me know when he would like to have her. . . .

I asked then what her plans for vacation are. Julia said that when she was with her father on Father's Day, he had said that he wants her to come to his home for the first week, but that she wants to go to her mother first. I said that it must be pretty hard to decide what to do in such a situation. She cried a little bit but tried hard to conceal her tears. She said she had had a good time at home over Father's Day, that she likes seeing her sisters, but that she likes her mother better than her father even though she knows that her father thinks her mother is no good. "My father isn't always right either—my mother doesn't do anything wrong." I was sure that she feels strongly for her mother, and thought it must be hard for her to hear her father say such things. . . .

Later—Julia has received a letter from her father saying that it was all right for her to come to his home directly from having visited her mother.

Julia's is the common problem of many children living in institutions. Our insistence on the parents' participation in the placement experience has the effect at times of increasing the problem for the child. While the participation brings both parents closer to him, it brings with it at the same time antagonism toward each other. The child is caught between them and consequently left with the burden of the struggle. I am profoundly impressed again and again by the child's capacity to carry this burden. Somehow and often through painful struggle, he learns to live with the knowledge of his parents' inadequacies and unquestionably is fortified by the caseworker's recognition of his problem and her acceptance of the parents with all their limitations.

As stated earlier, placement in an institution cannot be a permanent plan. The ultimate goal for child and parent is the child's return to his home. The time of his leaving the institution is dependent upon many and varying circumstances and may be the culmination of long and careful planning on the part of the worker and parent. The plans may include referral to another agency for help with the child while in

his own home, or referral to a more restricted environment for the child who cannot learn to conform to the institution group and the larger community. The time of leaving may be delayed if the parent is unwilling to assume this final obligation.

When the child has been free to use the group living experience deeply, he will be ready to leave it and to go forward to the new life ahead and the parent who has sustained him and the institution will have likewise developed a readiness to reassume the full obligation of his parenthood.

We see, then, the place of casework in the institution as clearly defined and limited. From the beginning of the intake process until the time of the child's leaving the caseworker, supported by other institution staff, is using her skill in helping child and parent in order that the child may achieve a rich experience in the group living and a preparation for the future.

How the Case Record Exhibit Was Used By a State Department of Welfare

THE League was very generous in letting us have the exhibit so long and I think you might therefore like to know what was done with it and what was thought about it. It was used in seven of our ten districts. A district is made up of about twelve local offices under the general supervision of a field representative. Only one of these had actually used the exhibit last year and so could base a new experience on an old one. Some districts had a one or two day meeting of the whole group with some short discussions of typical problems and professional attitudes toward them scattered among longer periods of reading. Other districts took the records to two or three offices and the near-by staff would come in there and read continuously, discussing their observations with the field representative or the child welfare consultant. When it was all over I met with the field representatives to ask what value they had seen in it and whether they would want to do something similar another year. I was very interested in some of the comments made.

It was unanimously noted that although many of the local workers are usually well aware of the fact they have a long drive home and are ready to leave early, when they were at the meeting with the records they stayed considerably later than had been planned. I got a sense, that I could never relate to any specific incident, that many of the local people

felt there was a generosity in the state staff's bringing something to them which they did not have to struggle to produce out of their limited time and equipment, and that they valued it as an evidence of "giving." All over the state these untrained and unsophisticated workers marveled that the things presented in these fine records was not a multiplicity of resources nor of technical language, but something direct between worker and child which they themselves could understand and possibly approximate. Some commented that they got something out of this that was just as valuable to the general case load as to the children's load. Two counties developed a project with their field representatives of carrying one or two cases with considerably more thought and detail than is usually done. In another district several had rushed out to buy Gordon Hamilton's book on recording. What they say is that perhaps this will help them do the kind of work they see in the exhibit. I assume it means also that they can keep something on their desk that will symbolize their interest in a more professional performance. In another section there has been a request for a discussion group on their own records. The simple matter of first person recording made one or two stop to think about their own way of working.

One of the field representatives, a capable person who has been with us a long time, commented that aside from what it did for her local workers it was a professional stimulus to her personally, which had a lot of significance.

The group as a whole felt that all of them would want to use the exhibit again next year if it is available to us then. We will want to avoid the period when annual budgets are made up and the period of blizzards (one district having been completely disorganized in its plans by two snowstorms) so would hope to use it before December or after March. Careful study by the field staff before the exhibit goes to the districts suffered this year because the exhibit was late arriving and had to start traveling immediately. The last week of the month when the local offices are preparing monthly reports is a bad time for localities anyhow, so next time we hope the exhibit could be in state office the last week of the month for study by state staff and then go to the districts. We anticipate having twelve instead of ten districts next year. The group felt there would be fewer large meetings and more taking the exhibit to small groups in different parts of the districts.

LOIS BENEDICT, *Director,*
Children's Bureau, Virginia Department of Public Welfare

Educational Opportunities—Summer Courses

FORTUNATELY for agencies interested in increasing the competence of staff members and thereby improving the quality of service offered to children, many of the schools of social work are offering summer institutes. In recent weeks we have received notice of institutes from the Louisiana State, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Richmond, Smith, and Western Reserve schools of social work. The institutes offered by these schools cover almost every aspect of child welfare, casework, supervision, and community organization.

These brief institutes and the regular summer sessions offered by many of the schools afford an opportunity for study to executives, supervisors and caseworkers with graduate training who might not otherwise be able, by reason of their responsibilities, to get away. In the light of the serious shortage of qualified personnel and the training responsibility which this places upon agencies, every effort should be made to release staff members in positions of leadership for such study.

Summer institutes are by no means a substitute for the program of longer periods of study made possible by scholarships and educational leave now in operation in many agencies. Nor are they a substitute for full-time professional training in residence at an accredited school of social work. They do afford, however, an opportunity to supplement such programs, to broaden the knowledge of staff members, and to bring fresh viewpoints to the work of the agency. Agencies will need to make every effort to utilize the training resources offered by these summer sessions and institutes. It might be well to hold a staff meeting to discuss training interests. Summer sessions and institutes often attract many professionally qualified and experienced people so that an agency considering such a plan could expect a good return for funds invested in such program.

In addition to the above-mentioned schools, some of which offer both regular summer session and institutes, summer terms for 1947 have been announced by Boston University, Our Lady of the Lake (San Antonio), Indiana, Way (Detroit), and Washington University (St. Louis) schools of social work. Some are summer quarters, other schools give one or two six-week sessions.

Interested agencies should write directly to the schools for information. A list of all member schools of the American Association of Schools of Social Work can be obtained from the National AASSW office, 130 East 22nd Street, New York 10, but

neither that office nor the League has a complete list of all summer courses offered. However, the following schools of social work offered summer courses in 1946 and may be offering them this summer: University of Chicago, Denver, Michigan, Minnesota, St. Louis, Southern California, Toronto, Fordham (New York), and Washington State.

Just as it is important for agencies to get staff members back to school periodically for the current training and for the stimulation it gives the person and the agency, so it is important for the school people to get close to practice. Child caring agencies will be interested to know that frequently people who teach child welfare courses in schools of social work have a quarter, semester, or summer free. Several such teachers have expressed the desire to do some work in an agency. Agencies might consider such people for special projects or utilize their services in ways which would be stimulating to their staff while affording the educator the opportunity to keep close to practice. The League offers help in selected situations in bringing agency and school representative together.

MARY KEELEY

Staff Evaluation

FOR the past several years there have been increasing inquiries about evaluation. We have been asked such questions as, "What is the purpose of an evaluation; how does an agency proceed to have staff evaluated; what use is that put to; what special problems are created by the institution of the practice of staff evaluations."

The Child Welfare League of America therefore proceeded to study the question. First we sent an inquiry to our member agencies in 1945. The content and principles stated are still current, for changes in the process of evaluation are naturally slow.

The findings are extremely interesting. We did not realize for example how many agencies have an evaluation practice. The differences in expressed purpose are revealing, for on examination they appear less actual than theoretical. One of the challenging revelations was how seriously we are in need of a definition of what casework is if we are to evaluate performance. Another matter for consideration is that the evaluation process can be a great force both in the caseworker's taking on responsibility for her continued development, and in the agency's assumption of responsibility for enabling the worker to develop professionally. It seems, too, that this practice feels like a threat when untrained personnel are struggling with giving a professional service. Where

there has been no basic screening by a school of social work the agency may need to do some drastic weeding out of those employed under stress of staff shortage. The fear engendered by evaluation could be reduced to a minimum by sound personnel practices. Agencies may wish as a part of this examination to do a job analysis, that is, an examination of what specifically is their job expectation for caseworkers. They may wish to use the Social Casework Council job analysis distributed last year by the Child Welfare League of America.

But this is not intended as a preview or summary of the mimeographed findings which the League is distributing this week and which will be available for sale at 50 cents per copy. Rather it is by way of saying that this report is a preliminary one, that agencies are being asked to hold staff meetings for careful study of the findings. We hope that they will submit to the League questions, comments, suggestions for modification of this report so that at a later date we will have this additional thinking to include in a final report.

BOOK NOTES

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION FOR SOCIAL WELFARE, Wayne McMillen. University of Chicago Press. 1946. 658 pp. \$4.75.

Dr. Wayne McMillen has made a notable contribution to the profession and practice of social welfare through his book on community organization. This contribution is worthy partly because of the broad expanse of social welfare skills and practices which Dr. McMillen believes are related to and involved in community organization and further because of the clear distinction drawn between community organization as a process and the operation of skills and practices in service programs of welfare agencies.

This book of more than 600 pages is of two parts. The first part deals with the various factors inherent in the orderly performance of social or welfare work represented in welfare functional agencies and services of all types which, by their very operations, are inextricably bound up with the community organization process. The second part is concerned with the organization, structure and functioning of those agencies engaged specifically in co-ordinating and planning.

Early in the first part of the book the premise is introduced that,

"it is important to consider the functional social agency, not only from the standpoint of its traditional program for clients, but also from the point of view of its potentialities as a medium for community organization."

From this premise there grows throughout the pages of this book a gamut of relationships, active and potential, stemming from the social worker's ad-

ministrative duties in his daily work, which have a community organization significance. Since the term "community organization" is characterized as a process whose

"main objective is to help people to find ways to give expression to . . . inherent desires to improve the environment in which they and their fellows must carry on their lives"

there is scarcely a function performed by a public or voluntary welfare agency that does not in some degree depend upon or contribute to, the co operative process of community development for better living.

The importance of the professional social worker and the functional social agency in this process is stressed. The social worker and his agency, including the members of the governing body, board or public official, constitute units of operation one of whose important responsibilities is to be exercised on behalf of a complete and strong welfare system as the result of a community organization process. For example, the mere effort by public and voluntary agency executives to find practical working relationships in terms of divisions of labor, is of the nature of community organization; likewise is the identifying of an unmet welfare need by a functional agency and the finding of ways to meet the need, a step in the community organization process. The pages of the book's first part are loaded with evidence of the basic contribution made toward community social welfare in the normal services of functional agencies when directed by wise executives and managing bodies. This contribution is inherent in the development of agency leadership, in the agency's individualizing and knowing its local community, in making its approach to its community as guided by the agency's executive and in the agency's plan of public relations or program interpretation.

In light of this evidence, welfare executives and social work practitioners, in all fields of service, may benefit from a study of this book. The reader finds himself transported to a different and significant level of thought. He is gradually led to realize his part in a process of which he was before not so much aware. And he will further appreciate the need that he become a more conscious and orderly participant in the process. To sample the tenor and value of Dr. McMillen's contribution one need only read Chapter VIII, The Approach to the Community; or the advice about the social worker and political activity beginning on page 185; and the account of the child welfare worker in public relations found on page 280.

This is a teaching book. There is an unusual richness to be found in the documents reproduced at the close of each chapter which supplement and reinforce the author's presentations. The book is not only of

great value to students in training for welfare work but may well be a "must" for welfare workers on the job, particularly executives of functional agencies, members of their managing boards as well as executives and staff members of co-ordinating and planning organizations.

WILFRED S. REYNOLDS, *Director*
Council of Social Agencies of Chicago

SCHEDULED SALARIES FOR SOCIAL WORK POSITIONS IN HOSPITALS IN NEW YORK CITY, December, 1946. Russell Sage Foundation, N. Y., 42 pp. 1947. 40 cents.

The Russell Sage Foundation has just released a study conducted by Ralph G. Hurlin, Director of the Department of Statistics, which is concerned with "Scheduled Salaries for Social Work Positions in Hospitals in New York City—December, 1946." The study, which is divided into five sections, deals with the auspices of the hospitals employing social workers, the salaries in voluntary hospitals and the related conditions of employment, together with the schedules of two voluntary hospitals and four governmental hospitals within the city.

The salary data were collected for the primary purpose of providing a partial test of the currency of information obtained earlier in the year in a wider inquiry relating to social work salaries in medical agencies, which will be published later. Important changes have occurred since that time and the present information has been released in order that it may be immediately useful to both employing agencies and individual social workers.

In December of 1946 there were at least 95 hospitals in New York City employing more than 600 social workers. The voluntary hospitals number more than three-fifths of the total number of employing institutions but somewhat less than that proportion of the workers. The American Red Cross employs the social workers in the six Army and Navy hospitals and some of the workers serving in municipal hospitals are paid from other sources. Thus, only one-third of the workers studied are governmental employees.

The data obtained relate to the social work positions in the Federal hospitals, Veterans Administration, U. S. Public Health, American Red Cross, New York State Department of Mental Hygiene and New York City Department of Hospitals. The salary plans for the three government hospital groups also apply to a larger number of workers employed outside of New York City.

Changes in salaries had taken place within the year 1946, most of the increases occurring in the

second half of the year, and increases are about to become effective in twelve voluntary hospitals and for the city-employed workers of the City Department of Hospitals. Mention was also made of the possibility of increases in the salaries of the State Department of Mental Hygiene in April of 1947.

Of the thirty social work departments in voluntary hospitals information was received from twenty-four in October of 1946 and later requested from four other hospitals. The twenty-eight departments have been grouped as large, medium or small, depending on the number of workers employed. The two largest, both with more than thirty positions are those of Mt. Sinai and Presbyterian. The increases noted late in 1946 and the projected increases are due partly to activities of the American Association of Social Workers through committees and of the Social Service Employees Union. The marked increase in the cost of living and the growing recognition of the inadequacy of social work salaries in relation to the nature of the work and the preparation for it, are two important factors.

Schedules of salaries for various grades of workers, increments, hours of work, provision for retirement, vacation, holidays and sick leave are given and compared.

Mr. Hurlin's study is a very important contribution at this time to both the social agency and to the individual social worker. The large number of vacancies on social agency staffs, the increasing demands from both private agencies and governmental departments, and the inability of the schools to provide a sufficient number of trained workers to meet these demands, has resulted in competition for the services of the limited supply available. It has been necessary, therefore, for employing agencies to give thought not only to increases in salaries, but to the personnel practices of the agency. Some progress is being made in the classification and establishment of criteria looking toward the improvement in service to the client and in the conditions under which the worker is employed. The data on the present situation and plans already formulated show that we are moving away from the traditional view that a large part of the social worker's compensation should be other than financial.

Mr. Hurlin's study will be of very specific help to administrators, social workers and others in the evaluation of current salaries and conditions of work, and should stimulate further planning.

ETHEL B. BELLSMITH

*Supervisor of Social Work,
Central Islip State Hospital, Central Islip, New York*